

REMARKS

Claims 15-42 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-14 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 15, 16, 18, 20 and 28 are amended, and claims 29-42 are added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Santiago to Applicants' representative during the June 3, 2004 personal interview. Applicants' summary of the interview is encompassed in the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 15

Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,877,777 to Colwell. The rejection of claim 1 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 1. The rejection of claim 15 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that Colwell fails to disclose the combination of features recited in amended claim 15, including, inter alia, hit check processing means for determining whether an object has been hit by a player using a controller and impact computation means which computes an impact position at which an impact is imparted to the object hit in real-time surface that has been distorted after the impact was imparted to the object, wherein the distortion computation means comprises point-to-be-moved determination means which determines at least one surface-specifying point that is to be moved, based on the impact position, from among surface-specifying points that are distributed over the surface of the object or in a vicinity of the object for defining the primitive surface that forms the object. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Colwell fails to disclose all the features of claim 15. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 16-18

Claims 2-4 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Colwell in view of U.S. Patent 5,731,819 to Gagne et al. ("Gagne"). The rejection of claims 2-4 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 2-4. The rejection of claims 16-18 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 15, from which claims 16-18 depend, Applicants submit that Colwell fails to disclose all the features of claim 15. Applicants further submit that Gagne at least fails to overcome the deficiencies of Colwell as discussed above with regard to claim 15. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell and Gagne fails to disclose all the features of claims 16-18, which depend from claim 15. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5-9, 12, 19-23, and 26

Claims 5-9, 12, 19-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Colwell and Gagne in view of U.S. Patent 6,417,861 to Deering ("Deering"). The rejection of claims 5-9 and 12 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 5-9 and 12. The rejection of claims 19-23 and 26 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claims 15 and 16, from which claims 19, 21-23 and 26 depend, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell and Gagne fails to disclose all the features of claims 15 and 16. Applicants further submit that Deering at least fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Colwell and Gagne, as discussed above with regard to claims 15 and 16.

With regard to claim 20, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell, Gagne and Deering fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 20 including, inter alia, hit check processing means for determining whether an object has been hit by a

player using a controller, impact computation means which computes an impact position at which an impact is imparted to the object hit in real-time, wherein the distortion computation means comprises point-to-be-moved determination means which determines at least one surface-specifying point that is to be moved, based on the impact position, from among surface-specifying points that are distributed over the surface of the object or in a vicinity of the object for defining the primitive surface that forms the object, and the magnitude of distortion due to the impact is determined by at least one of a material of the object subjected to the impact and a type of the impact.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell, Gagne and Deering fails to disclose all the features of claim 20 and all the features of claims 19, 21-23 and 26, which depend from claims 15 and 16. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, and 27

Claims 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Colwell and Gagne in view of U.S. Patent 6,417,861 to Isowaki et al. ("Isowaki"). The rejection of claims 10, 11 and 13 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 10, 11 and 13. The rejection of claims 24, 25 and 27 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claims 15 and 16, from which claims 24, 25 and 27 depend, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell and Gagne fails to disclose all the features of claims 15 and 16. Applicants further submit that Isowaki at least fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Colwell and Gagne, as discussed above with regard to claims 15 and 16. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Colwell, Gagne and Isowaki fails to disclose all the features of claims 24, 25

and 27, which depend from claims 15 and 16. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 28

Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Isowaki in view of Colwell. The rejection of claim 14 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 14. The rejection of claim 18 is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that neither Isowaki nor Colwell, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 28, including, inter alia, hit check processing for determining whether an object has been hit by a player using a controller, point-to-be-moved determination means that operates when an impact is imparted to the object, for determining at least one vertex to be moved, based on an imparted impact position when an impact is imparted to the object hit in real-time. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Isowaki and Colwell fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 28. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 29-33 and 35-41

With regard to new claims 29-33 and 35-41, Applicants submit that none of the references of record disclose or suggest a game method comprising the combination of features recited in claim 29 including, inter alia, performing hit check processing to determine whether an object has been hit by a player using a controller, and computing an impact position at which an impact is imparted to the object hit in real-time.

Claim 34

With regard to new claim 34, Applicants submit that none of the references of record disclose or suggest a game method comprising the combination of features recited in claim 34 including, inter alia, performing hit check processing to determine whether an object has been hit by a player using a controller, computing an impact position at which an impact is imparted

to the object hit in real-time ... wherein, a density of distribution of the surface-specifying points is adjusted in accordance with a magnitude of distortion of the object due to an impact, and the magnitude of distortion of the object due to the impact is determined by at least one of a material of the object subjected to the impact and a type of the impact.

Claim 42

With regard to new claim 42, Applicants submit that none of the references of record disclose or suggest a game method comprising the combination of features recited in claim 42 including, inter alia, performing hit check processing to determine whether an object has been hit by a player using a controller and determining at least one vertex to be moved, based on an imparted impact position when an impact is imparted to the object hit in real-time.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Amendment Transmittal

Date: June 17, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
